

Curvature and Cosmic Repulsion*

Philip D. Mannheim

Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269
mannheim@uconnvm.uconn.edu

Abstract

Some recent supernovae studies have extended the distance versus velocity Hubble plot to very high redshift, and have revealed the apparent presence of a cosmic repulsion. We show that such a repulsion has a natural origin within conformal gravity, a fully covariant candidate alternative to standard gravity, and that it arises from the gravitational field itself via the negative spatial curvature which conformal cosmology is required to possess. In this same cosmology the flatness, horizon and cosmological constant problems are all resolved, and no need is found for dark matter.

Very recently two independent groups [1–3] have reported some new high z redshift data which appear to have some potentially far reaching implications for cosmology. Specifically, by using type Ia supernovae as standard candles the two groups were able to extend the Hubble plot of distance ($d_L = r_1 R^2(t_0)/R(t_1)$) versus velocity ($z = R(t_0)/R(t_1) - 1$) out to redshifts of order $z = 1$. (Here the source coordinates (t_1, r_1) are related to the observer coordinates $(t_0, 0)$ via $\int_{t_1}^{t_0} dt R(t)^{-1} = \int_0^{r_1} dr (1 - kr^2)^{-1/2}$.) The great utility of these new data is that they extend way beyond the small z region where $H(t_0)d_L = z + (1 - q(t_0))z^2/2$, to thus enable us to explore the deceleration parameter $q(t)$ at both low and high z . Indeed not only do the new data show that $H(t_0)d_L - z$ is positive at low z (so that $q(z = 0)$ is less than one), the data also show that $q(z = 1)$ is smaller still. The data thus (very qualitatively) suggest that $q(t)$ may actually be an increasing function of time, i.e. that the universe may be speeding up.

In order to quantify their results the two groups try to fit their data to the predictions of the standard Einstein gravity cosmology based on the evolution equation

$$\dot{R}^2(t) + kc^2 = \dot{R}^2(t)\Omega_M(t) + \dot{R}^2(t)\Omega_V(t) \quad (1)$$

where $\Omega_M(t) = 8\pi G\rho_M(t)/3c^2H^2(t)$ is due to ordinary matter and $\Omega_V(t) = 8\pi G\Lambda/3c^2H^2(t)$ is due to a cosmological constant Λ . Specifically, they find that the popular standard inflationary universe [4] paradigm ($k = 0$, $\Omega_M(t) = 1$, $\Omega_V(t) = 0$, $\rho_M(t) = A_M/R^3(t)$, $R(t) = t^{2/3}$, $q(t) = \Omega_M(t)/2 = 1/2$, $H(t_0)d_L = 2(1+z)(1 - (1+z^2)^{-1/2})$) also leads to values for d_L which are less than the observed ones at high z , to thus not only exclude the standard paradigm, but

*astro-ph/9803135, March 11, 1998

to also show that $q(z = 1)$ is quite a bit less than $1/2$. The pure vacuum dominated inflationary universe limit ($k = 0$, $\Omega_M(t) = 0$, $\Omega_V(t) = 1$, $R(t) = \exp((8\pi G\Lambda/3c^2)^{1/2}t)$, $q(t) = -1$, $H(t_0)d_L = z(1+z)$) leads to values for d_L which are somewhat greater than the observed ones at high z . The data thus lie somewhere between these two extremes (that positive Λ gives negative $q(t)$ is of course the reason why the inflationary universe actually inflates), with $q(t)$ thus lying between -1 and $+1/2$, and with it potentially being negative in the current universe. And indeed, the observers find that they are able to fit the data in the general inflation case ($\Omega_M(t) + \Omega_V(t) = 1$, $\Omega_V(t)/\Omega_M(t) = (1 - 2q(t))/2(1 + q(t))$, $q(t) = -1 + (3/2)\text{sech}^2\theta(t)$ where $\theta(t) = 3(8\pi G\Lambda/3c^2)^{1/2}t/2 + \text{arcsinh}((\Lambda/A_M)^{1/2}R^{3/2}(t = 0))$) with best fits centering around $\Omega_V(t_0)/\Omega_M(t_0) = 3$, to yield a time dependent $q(t)$ with a currently negative value of $q(t_0) = -5/8$ (albeit with big systematic errors which permit $q(t_0)$ values up to $q(t_0) = 0$). The groups also explore the non-zero spatial curvature region by allowing $\Omega_M(t_0)$ and $\Omega_V(t_0)$ to vary freely and report their results out as an allowed region in the $(\Omega_M(t_0), \Omega_V(t_0))$ space which favors large $\Omega_V(t_0)$ and small or even zero $\Omega_M(t_0)$ and is centered around $\Omega_V(t_0) = \Omega_M(t_0) + 0.5$. In passing they note that the only acceptable fits that they could find in which $\Omega_V(t_0)$ is taken to be zero turn out to require negative $\Omega_M(t_0)$, viz. again negative $q(t)$ ($= \Omega_M(t)/2$), and now negative values of $G\rho_M(t)$, i.e. effectively repulsive gravity. In addition, such a cosmology also has negative k . In passing the groups also note that a fit with no matter at all ($\Omega_M(t) = 0$, $\Omega_V(t) = 0$), viz. the pure negative curvature case ($R(t) = (-k)^{1/2}ct + R(t = 0)$, $q(t) = 0$, $H(t_0)d_L = (1 + z)\log(1 + z)$) is just at the allowed limit of their systematic errors. The fits to the data thus all point in the direction of the existence of some sort of cosmic repulsion, and indirectly suggest that it may even potentially be related to the spatial curvature of the universe.

While the above analysis shows that it is phenomenologically possible to find values of $\Omega_M(t_0)$ and $\Omega_V(t_0)$ for which standard gravity is able to fit the data, it is important to recognize that all of the inferred allowed values pose a severe theoretical challenge to the standard theory. Specifically, only one solution to the familiar flatness fine tuning problem of the standard cosmology has so far been seriously considered, viz. inflation, a solution which then requires $\Omega_M(t) + \Omega_V(t) = 1$ to a very high degree of accuracy. However, in order to implement this condition, it is necessary to fix the value of the cosmological constant Λ , an as yet totally unresolved issue in standard gravity. Indeed, in standard gravity $\Omega_V(t_0)/\Omega_M(t_0)$ could be as large 10^{120} . Because this is such an enormous number it has widely been believed that there would exist some as yet unidentified mechanism (such as some symmetry) which would then bring $\Omega_V(t)$ all the way down to zero. However, the ensuing $\Omega_M(t) = 1$ cosmology now appears to have been excluded by the new high z data. While inflation could still be saved by having non-zero $\Omega_V(t) = 1 - \Omega_M(t)$, to achieve this would appear to require a fine tuning for $\Omega_V(t)$ which would then be up to 60 orders of magnitude more severe than the flatness one for which inflation was introduced in the first place.¹ Thus a non-vanishing Λ only serves to make the cosmological constant problem even more severe than before, with

¹In passing we note that the very introduction of such a non-zero $\Omega_V(t)$ would then change the expansion rate of the universe to $R(t) = (A_M/\Lambda)^{1/3}\sinh^{2/3}\theta(t)$, to then potentially affect standard primordial nucleosynthesis calculations, and especially so if $\Omega_V(t) \simeq 1$, a situation where $R(t)$ would then have to be growing at a close to exponential rate.

these new data essentially obliging the community to now have to deal with the cosmological constant problem head on.

Faced with the severity of this longstanding issue, a few years ago Mannheim [5] suggested that the problem lay not with some as yet unspecified dynamics, but rather with the very starting point of standard gravity, viz. the use of the Einstein-Hilbert action in the first place. Specifically, he noted that there is currently no known principle which would actually select out the Einstein-Hilbert action as the unique one for gravity (and thus none to simultaneously constrain the cosmological constant as well), and that one could just as well consider other equally covariant pure metric theories of gravity based on higher order derivative actions instead. Motivated by the fact that the three other fundamental interactions all possess actions with dimensionless couplings and dynamically induced masses, he proposed (as had others before him - dating back as far as Weyl in fact) that gravity be endowed with an additional underlying conformal invariance (viz. invariance under $g_{\mu\nu}(x) \rightarrow \Omega(x)g_{\mu\nu}(x)$), an invariance which then yields $I_W = -\alpha \int d^4x (-g)^{1/2} C_{\lambda\mu\nu\kappa} C^{\lambda\mu\nu\kappa}$ (where $C_{\lambda\mu\nu\kappa}$ is the conformal Weyl tensor and α is purely dimensionless) as its unique gravitational action. Conformal symmetry thus emerges as a symmetry that naturally sets any fundamental cosmological constant term to zero. Moreover, Mannheim also noted [5–7] that because of the tracelessness of the conformal energy-momentum tensor any cosmological term which might be induced by the spontaneous breaking of the conformal symmetry would have to be of order the energy density of all the other terms in $T^{\mu\nu}$, so that $\Omega_V(t)$ would then nicely be precisely of order the energy density associated with $\Omega_M(t)$ and/or of order that associated with the gravitational field itself, to thus make it possible to naturally yield an $\Omega_V(t)$ term of order $\Omega_M(t)$.

To illustrate this point explicitly it is convenient to consider as matter action the typical case of fermionic matter fields Yukawa coupled to scale breaking scalars. For them, the most general covariant, conformal invariant matter action I_M takes the form

$$I_M = -\hbar \int d^4x (-g)^{1/2} [S^\mu S_\mu / 2 + \lambda S^4 - S^2 R^\mu{}_\mu / 12 + i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(x)(\partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu(x))\psi - gS\bar{\psi}\psi] \quad (2)$$

where $\Gamma_\mu(x)$ is the fermion spin connection and g and λ are dimensionless coupling constants. When the scalar field $S(x)$ in I_M acquires a non-vanishing vacuum expectation value (which we are free to set equal to a spacetime independent constant S because of the conformal invariance), the fermion then obeys the curved space Dirac equation $i\hbar\gamma^\mu(x)[\partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu(x)]\psi = \hbar gS\psi$ and acquires a mass $\hbar gS$. For macroscopic purposes we note that the incoherent averaging of the fermion kinetic energy operator $i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu(x)(\partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu(x))\psi$ over all the occupied positive frequency modes of this Dirac equation leads us [6] to a standard kinematic perfect fluid of these fermions with energy-momentum tensor $T_M^{\mu\nu} = (\rho_M + p_M)U^\mu U^\nu + p_M g^{\mu\nu}$; while the averaging of the total energy-momentum tensor and of the scalar field equation of motion associated with Eq. (2) respectively lead us to the equations

$$T^{\mu\nu} = T_M^{\mu\nu} - \hbar S^2 (R^{\mu\nu} - g^{\mu\nu} R^\alpha{}_\alpha / 2) / 6 - g^{\mu\nu} \hbar \lambda S^4 \quad (3)$$

$$\hbar S^2 R^\alpha{}_\alpha - 24\hbar\lambda S^4 + 6(3p_M - \rho_M) = 0 \quad (4)$$

The covariant conservation of the total $T^{\mu\nu}$ thus enforces that of the kinematic $T_M^{\mu\nu}$ as well, so that $T_M^{\mu\nu}$ behaves exactly the same way in conformal gravity as it does in standard gravity.

Because of the tracelessness of the total conformal $T^{\mu\nu}$, Eqs. (3) and (4) immediately entail that the induced cosmological $\hbar\lambda S^4 = \Lambda$ term is precisely of order ρ_M and/or of order $\hbar S^2 R^\alpha_\alpha$, with its explicit numerical value self-consistently adjusting itself to however many fermionic modes are occupied in $T_M^{\mu\nu}$ in whatever is the appropriate geometry. It is in this way then that the cosmological constant is kept under control in conformal gravity, with it being precisely the lack of any such self-consistency which leaves the cosmological constant problem unresolved in standard gravity. As we shall now see, it is precisely this very same conformal self-consistency which will lead us naturally to the negative curvature dominated universe suggested by the new high z data.

To this end we note that the appropriate geometry needed for Eqs. (3) and (4) is given by the conformal gravity field equations $(-g)^{-1/2}\delta I_W/\delta g_{\mu\nu} = -2\alpha W^{\mu\nu} = -T^{\mu\nu}/2$. Since $W^{\mu\nu}$ vanishes identically in a Robertson-Walker geometry (this metric being conformal to flat), in cosmology the conformal gravity equations reduce to $T^{\mu\nu} = 0$, to yield

$$\dot{R}^2(t) + kc^2 = -3\dot{R}^2(t)(\Omega_M(t) + \Omega_\Lambda(t))/4\pi S^2 L_{PL}^2 \equiv \dot{R}^2(t)\bar{\Omega}_M(t) + \dot{R}^2(t)\bar{\Omega}_\Lambda(t) \quad (5)$$

written here in a particular convenient and suggestive form which involves $L_{PL} = (\hbar G/c^3)^{1/2}$ and the previously introduced $\Omega_M(t)$, though the ratio $\Omega_M(t)/L_{PL}^2$ is of course independent of G . As we see, Eq. (5) only differs from the analogous standard model Eq. (1) in one regard, namely that the quantity $-\hbar S^2/12$ has replaced $c^3/16\pi G$. From the point of view of the standard model, Eq. (5) would have been obtained in standard gravity if standard gravity were repulsive rather than attractive, with the back reaction of the scalar field on the geometry in conformal gravity thus acting like an induced effective repulsive rather than attractive gravitational term in the conformal case, to thus nicely generate what would have been regarded in the standard model as a negative $G\rho_M$ term (an apparently allowed solution to the analysis of the recent high z data given above). Because of this crucial change in sign, the $\dot{R}^2$ and $\dot{R}^2\bar{\Omega}_M(t) = -3\dot{R}^2\Omega_M(t)/4\pi S^2 L_{PL}^2$ terms are not required to cancel each other so that the fine tuning flatness problem present in the standard model is simply not encountered in the conformal case [6]. Moreover, unless the coefficient λ is overwhelmingly negative, Eq. (5) can only have solutions at all if k is negative, and we are thus led naturally to a topologically open, negatively spatially curved universe. (Essentially the only way the geometry can cancel the positive energy density of ordinary matter and maintain $T^{\mu\nu} = 0$ is if the gravitational field itself contains the negative energy associated with negative spatial curvature.) Conformal gravity thus nicely generates the negative k solution suggested by the analysis of the recent high z data given above.

Before discussing further the cosmological implications of Eq. (5), since we do have an effective repulsive Einstein tensor in Eq. (3), we need to see whether the conformal theory nonetheless has a good non-relativistic Newtonian limit. To this end we note that Mannheim and Kazanas [8,9] found that for a static, spherically symmetric source, the equations of conformal gravity reduce exactly (and without any approximation whatsoever) to $\nabla^4 B(r) = f(r)$ where $B(r) = -g_{00}(r)$ and $f(r) = 3(T^0_0 - T^r_r)/4\alpha B(r)$; with the solution exterior to a source such as a star then taking the generic form $ds^2 = B(r)c^2 dt^2 - dr^2/B(r) - r^2 d\Omega$ where $B(r) = 1 - 2\beta^*/r + \gamma^* r$ (see also Riegert [10]), and with the coefficients obeying $\beta^* = \int_0^{R_0} dr r^4 f(r)/6$ and $\gamma^* = -\int_0^{R_0} dr r^2 f(r)/2$ for a star of radius R_0 . We thus see that for small enough γ^* all the classic Schwarzschild metric tests of General Relativity can also be met in conformal gravity (so that the Einstein-Hilbert action turns out to

only be sufficient to yield Schwarzschild but not necessary), with the obtained conformal gravity Newtonian potential term being universally attractive for an appropriate sign of the fundamental coupling constant α . Conformal gravity thus demotes G from fundamental status (to incidentally thereby demote the Planck length L_{PL} from fundamental status and thus decouple it from quantum gravity fluctuations), with the sign of the coefficient β^* bearing no relation at all to the sign of the induced Einstein tensor term obtained in Eq. (3). Solar system gravity is thus seen to not be a good guide as to whether gravity is attractive or not on altogether different distance scales, with the difficulties that standard gravity faces cosmologically perhaps being ascribable to its insistence that gravity actually be attractive (and of strength G) on those scales too.

Given the uncovering of the above linear γ^*r term we immediately have to ask whether there is any evidence which might support its possible existence. To this end Mannheim [11,12] noted an interesting, purely phenomenological fact regarding galactic rotation curves. Specifically, he found that the centripetal accelerations of the furthest data points in a large class of well studied spiral galaxies all obey the universal relation

$$(v^2/c^2 R)_{last} = \gamma_0/2 + \gamma^* N^*/2 + \beta^* N^*/R^2 \quad (6)$$

where the two new universal constants γ_0 and γ^* take numerical values $3.06 \times 10^{-30} \text{ cm}^{-1}$ (a value strikingly close to the inverse of the Hubble radius) and $5.42 \times 10^{-41} \text{ cm}^{-1}$ respectively. This purely empirical formula (which dark matter halo models are therefore now obliged to reproduce) then reveals the existence of not one but two linear potentials, with only one ($\gamma^* N^* c^2 r/2$) being associated with the material inside the galaxy. As regards the galaxy independent term associated with γ_0 , Mannheim went on to show that it was generated by the material outside of each galaxy, i.e. by the rest of the universe. (Once the potential is not of the $1/r$ form exterior matter sources can never be ignored, and especially so if their potentials actually grow with distance.) Moreover, since the general coordinate transformation $r = \rho/(1 - \gamma_0 \rho/4)^2$, $t = \int d\tau/R(\tau)$ effects the metric transformation

$$(1 + \gamma_0 r)c^2 dt^2 - \frac{dr^2}{(1 + \gamma_0 r)} - r^2 d\Omega \rightarrow \frac{(1 + \rho\gamma_0/4)^2}{R^2(\tau)(1 - \rho\gamma_0/4)^2} \left(c^2 d\tau^2 - \frac{R^2(\tau)(d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\Omega)}{(1 - \rho^2\gamma_0^2/16)^2} \right) \quad (7)$$

we see that a static linear potential is conformally and coordinate equivalent to none other than a Robertson-Walker metric with the explicitly negative curvature given by $k = -(\gamma_0/2)^2 = -2.3 \times 10^{-60} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. Thus in its rest frame each comoving galaxy sees the entire cosmological Hubble flow acting as none other than a universal linear $\gamma_0 c^2 r/2$ potential term generated by the spatial curvature of the universe. With the use of these two linear potentials conformal gravity was then able [11,12] to provide for a complete, parameter free accounting of rotation curve systematics without the need to invoke galactic dark matter. We thus identify an explicit cosmological imprint on galactic rotation curves, recognize that it was its neglect that may have led to the need for galactic dark matter, and, for our purposes here, confirm from galactic data that the cosmological curvature k is indeed negative, just as desired for the new high z data.

Having now established some empirical evidence that k is indeed negative, we return to an examination of the cosmology based on Eq. (5). For the (simpler to treat) radiation era

where $\rho_M = A/R^4 = \sigma T^4$, exact k negative solutions can be found [6,7], with these solutions being sensitive only to the sign of λ . For $\lambda > 0$, $\lambda = 0$, and $\lambda < 0$ they are respectively given as

$$R^2(t) = R_{min}^2 + (R_{max}^2 - R_{min}^2)\sin^2(\pi t/\tau) \quad , \quad R^2(t) = -2A/k\hbar c S^2 - kc^2 t^2 \quad , \\ R^2(t) = R_{min}^2 + |R_{max}^2 - R_{min}^2|\sinh^2(\pi t/\tau) \quad (8)$$

where $\tau = \pi/cS(2|\lambda|)^{1/2}$ and where $(R_{max}^2, R_{min}^2) = (-k/4S^2\lambda)(1 \pm (1 - 16A\lambda/k^2\hbar c)^{1/2})$. In these solutions $\Omega_M(t)$ takes the values

$$\Omega_M(t, \lambda > 0) = \Omega_{min}/\sin^2(2\pi t/\tau) \quad , \quad \Omega_M(t, \lambda = 0) = 8\pi GA/3c^6 k^2 t^2 \quad , \\ \Omega_M(t, \lambda < 0) = \Omega_{min}/\sinh^2(2\pi t/\tau) \quad (9)$$

where $\Omega_{min} = 16\pi GA/3c^4|\lambda|S^2(R_{max}^2 - R_{min}^2)^2$, a quantity which can readily be set to be less than one for a continuous range of parameters. Since each $\Omega_M(t, \lambda)$ is infinite at $t = 0$ (in sharp contrast to the standard model where $\Omega_M(t = 0) = 1$) and since they go to either zero or Ω_{min} , each $\Omega_M(t, \lambda)$ has to pass through one at some time without any need for fine tuning, so that $\Omega_M(t_0)$ can readily be reasonably close to one today without needing to be identically equal to one, with the copious amounts of cosmological $\Omega_M = 1$ dark matter thus not being needed in the conformal case. Whether or not the cosmology recollapses is seen to depend on the sign of λ rather than on that of k (the case in the standard model). Moreover, in each case there is a non-zero minimum radius (and thus a maximum temperature T_{max}), with the cosmology thus being singularity free (precisely because it induces a repulsive gravitational component so that conformal gravity can protect itself from its own singularities - something of course not the case in standard gravity). The $\lambda > 0$ cosmology is the only one which recollapses, with a full cycle then taking a time τ . Since there are no singularities, this cycle is then free to repeat indefinitely.

All of the key features of these solutions can be exhibited directly in the $\lambda = 0$ case, with Eq. (8) then yielding

$$T_{max}^2/T^2(t) = 1/(1 - tH(t)) = 1 - 1/q(t) = 1 + 4\pi L_{PL}^2 S^2/3\Omega_M(t) \quad , \\ (-k)^{1/2}c \int_0^t dt/R(t) = \log[T_{max}/T + (T_{max}^2/T^2 - 1)^{1/2}] \quad (10)$$

Since $\Omega_M(t_0)$ is of order one today the scale parameter S must be at least as big as $10^{10}L_{PL}^{-1}$ if the early universe is to have a temperature of at least 10^{10} degrees. With this one (natural) condition it then follows in the $\lambda = 0$ case that the current value of the deceleration parameter is zero and that the age of the universe is $t_0 = 1/H(t_0)$, an age which nicely exceeds current globular cluster age limits. Further, in passing, we see that the horizon size is altogether greater than one at recombination, to thus yield a naturally causally connected cosmology.

Because of the huge value needed for S (i.e. because L_{PL} does not set the scale for conformal cosmology) Eq. (5) is found [7] to be realized in a very interesting way, with the $\dot{R}^2(t)$ and $\dot{R}^2(t)\bar{\Omega}_M(t) = -3\dot{R}^2(t)\Omega_M(t)/4\pi S^2 L_{PL}^2$ terms being found to have radically differing time behaviors, even as the quantity $\dot{R}^2(t)(1 - \bar{\Omega}_M(t))$ must remain equal (in the $\lambda = 0$ case) to the constant value $-c^2 k$. Specifically, as can be seen from Eq. (9), the quantity $\bar{\Omega}_M(t)$ can only be large in the early universe (where ρ_M sets the scale for $R(t = 0)$ in Eq.

(8)) with it having to fall to a value of order at least 10^{-20} today, thus causing the $\dot{R}^2(t_0)$ term to be completely dominant over $\dot{R}^2(t_0)\bar{\Omega}_M(t_0)$ today. Thus even while $\Omega_M(t_0)$ is nicely of order one today in conformal gravity, the specific conformal gravity source $\bar{\Omega}_M(t_0)$ itself is completely negligible today, with the late time (but not the early time) $\lambda = 0$ conformal cosmology then being curvature dominated. Moreover, this same late time decoupling of $\bar{\Omega}_M(t_0)$ also holds for both the $\lambda \neq 0$ case and the matter $\rho_M = A_M/R^3$ era as well [7]. Late time conformal cosmology is thus always curvature and/or λ dominated, and thus even while $\Omega_M(t_0)$ is non-zero, nonetheless the conformal gravity evolution equation Eq. (5) reduces at late times to $\dot{R}^2(t) + kc^2 = \dot{R}^2(t)\bar{\Omega}_\Lambda(t)$. Thus the late time conformal cosmology evolves exactly the same way as the standard model Eq. (1) would evolve if the standard model $\Omega_M(t_0)$ were to be set to zero. Thus the acceptable $\Omega_M(t_0) = 0$, $\Omega_V(t_0) \geq 0$ fits considered by the observers in their standard model analysis of the new high z data thus immediately apply to late time conformal cosmology case as well, with the attendant positive fitted values reported for $\Omega_V(t_0)$ entailing that the conformal cosmology parameter λ would then be negative. Conformal cosmology thus provides a natural (i.e. non fine tuned) explanation for a curvature and/or λ dominated late universe, a cosmology which naturally produces a cosmic repulsion and which appears to be fully compatible with currently available high z data.

As we have thus seen, rather than being ρ_M dominated, conformal cosmology actually becomes curvature and/or λ dominated at late times. While this curvature dominated cosmology is thus seen to be able to address some outstanding puzzles of the ρ_M dominated standard model, it is not itself yet completely free of problems, since it seems to be able to only produce substantial amounts of primordial helium and appears to be incapable (at least in the studied small λ limit) of reproducing other light element abundances [13,14]. Whether this is simply a property of using just the simple cosmology based on Eq. (5) or its $\lambda = 0$ limit (the now suggested large negative λ region still remains to be explored), and/or whether it could be resolved in more detailed dynamical conformal models remains to be addressed. However, independent of one's views regarding conformal gravity itself, the study we have presented here does provide a new and quite general way to approach cosmological issues, showing that once one is prepared to depart from the Einstein Equations, new options then become available. Additionally, our study has enabled us to explicitly determine the global topology of the universe, something which years of work in standard gravity has yet to accomplish. Since we have also shown that the cosmological constant problem, the flatness problem, the horizon problem, the dark matter problem, the universe age problem, and now the recent high z cosmic repulsion problem are not in fact generic to cosmology, their very existence may thus even be a signal that the extrapolation of standard gravity from the solar system to cosmology might be a lot less reliable than is commonly believed. The author would like to thank Dr. B. Schaefer for helpful comments. This work has been supported in part by the Department of Energy under grant No. DE-FG02-92ER40716.00.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. M. Garnavich, R. P. Kirshner, P. Challis, J. Tonry, R. L. Gilliland, R. C. Smith, A. Clocchiatti, A. Diercks, A. V. Filippenko, M. Hamuy, C. J. Hogan, B. Leibundgut, M. M. Phillips, D. Reiss, A. G. Reiss, B. P. Schmidt, R. A. Schommer, J. Spyromilio, C. Stubbs, N. B. Suntzeff and L. Wells, *Astrophys. J. Letts.* **493**, L53 (1998). See also *Science* **279**, 1298 (1998).
- [2] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, M. Della Valle, S. Deustua, R. S. Ellis, S. Fabbro, A. Fruchter, G. Goldhaber, D. E. Groom, I. M. Hook, A. G. Kim, M. Y. Kim, R. A. Knop, C. Lidman, R. G. McMahon, P. Nugent, R. Pain, N. Panagia, C. R. Pennypacker, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, B. Schaefer and N. Walton, *Nature* **391**, 51 (1998).
- [3] Supernova Cosmology Project presentation at the American Astronomical Society Meeting, Washington DC, January 1998.
- [4] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
- [5] P. D. Mannheim, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **22**, 289 (1990).
- [6] P. D. Mannheim, *Astrophys. J.* **391**, 429 (1992).
- [7] P. D. Mannheim, "Conformal Cosmology and the Age of the Universe", preprint UCONN 95-08, astro-ph/9601071, January 1996.
- [8] P. D. Mannheim and D. Kazanas, *Astrophys. J.* **342**, 635 (1989).
- [9] P. D. Mannheim and D. Kazanas, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **26**, 337 (1994).
- [10] R. J. Riegert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 315 (1984).
- [11] P. D. Mannheim, *Found. Phys.* **26**, 1683 (1996).
- [12] P. D. Mannheim, *Astrophys. J.* **479**, 659 (1997).
- [13] L. Knox and A. Kosowsky, "Primordial Nucleosynthesis in Conformal Weyl Gravity", Fermilab-Pub-93/322-A, astro-ph/9311006 (1993).
- [14] D. Elizondo and G. Yepes, *Astrophys. J.* **428**, 17 (1994).